

## **REMARKS**

### **§ 103 Rejections**

Claims 1, 6, 13-20, 26 and 30 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olson et al. (US 6261700) in view of Williams et al. (US 5855983).

### **Interview Summary**

The Applicant thanks the Examiners for the courtesy extended to their representative during the personal interview of August 22, 2006.

During the interview, the Applicant's representative reiterated that Olson et al. does not teach or suggest that the described ceramer composition is useful for the preparation of prisms of a brightness enhancing film and thus there is no motivation to employ the composition of Olson et al, with William et al. The Applicant's representative also reiterated that Olson et al. does not teach Applicant's specific claimed composition having at least 60 wt-% of a first monomer (such as RDX-51027) in combination with 5 to 30 wt-% of a crosslinking agent comprising at least three (meth)acrylate groups. As yet an additional distinction, Applicant's representative discussed that the ceramer compositions of Olson et al. generally include appreciable amounts of solvent in order that the composition can be processed and coated at the desired thickness. In contrast, the brightness enhancing films of the invention are prepared from substantially solvent-free polymerizable composition. The Examiner suggested that the Applicant file a declaration showing "back-to-back" test results for the polymerizable composition with and without solvent.

The Applicant notes that preparing back-to-back test results for a polymerizable composition of the invention with and without solvent is problematic as attested to in the attached declaration of David B. Olson, a coinventor of both the present patent application and the cited reference.

Claim 1 recites "a polymerizable resin consisting essentially of. . . " such claim language excludes the inclusion of components that materially affect the properties. Since based on the declaration of David B. Olson, it is clear that the inclusion of solvent materially affects the

suitability of the polymerizable resin to be used to prepared prisms of a brightness enhancing film, this claim is patentable over the combination of Olson et al. with Williams et al.

The Applicant notes that solvent was not added to any of the exemplified compositions. In addition, U.S. Patent Nos. 5,175,030 and 5,183,597 (i.e. Lu and Lu et al.) are expressly incorporated by reference in the present patent application (See p. 5, lines 1-3). These patents describe and claim the UV-curable resin compositions as being “solvent-free”. In view of such support, the specification has been amended to recite “solvent-free polymerizable compositions”. Independent claim 26, as well as dependent claims 32-33, recite that the polymerizable composition is solvent-free.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite a product-by-process, reciting that the polymerizable resin is cured between a preformed support and the molding surface.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

September 26, 2006

Date

By: /Carolyn A. Fischer/

Carolyn A. Fischer, Reg. No.: 39,091

Telephone No.: 651-575-3915

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833